### T/ Racist enforcement [:25]

Gun control will be unevenly enforced and lead to mass incarceration of poor minorities, **Gourevitch ‘15:**  
Alex Gourevitch 15 (Alex Gourevitch, assistant professor of political science at Brown University. He is author of From Slavery to the Cooperative Commonwealth: Labor and Republican Liberty in the Nineteenth Century and has written for magazines like Dissent, Jacobin, The American Prospect, and New York Magazine, ) Gun control’s racist reality: The liberal argument against giving police more power, Salon 6-24-2015 AT  
 It is perhaps counterintuitive to say so but gun control responses to mass killings – whether racially motivated or otherwise – are a deep mistake. The standard form of **gun control means** writing **more** criminal **laws,** creating new **crimes, and** therefore creating more criminals or **more reasons for police** to suspect people of crimes. More than that, it means creating yet more pretexts for a militarized police, **full of racial and class prejudice, to overpolice.** As multiple police killings of unarmed black men have reminded us, the police already operate with barely constrained force in poor, minority neighborhoods. From SWAT to stop-and-frisk to mass incarceration to parole monitoring, the police manage a panoply of programs that subject these populations to multiple layers of coercion and control. As a consequence, **more than 7 million** Americans **are subject to** some form of **correctional control, a**n extremely **disproportionate number** of whom are **poor and minority.** While it is commonly assumed that the drug war is to blame for all this, work by scholars like Benjamin Levin and Jeff Fagan demonstrates that already existing **gun control efforts** also **play an important role.** One of the most notorious areas of policing, the NYPD’s **stop-and-frisk** program, **was justified as** a **gun control** rather than a drug war measure. In the name of preventing violence, hundreds of thousands of poor minorities are subject to searches without probable cause each year. Further, a range of Supreme Court-authorized exceptions to standard Fourth Amendment protections against illegal search and seizure derive from a concern with gun violence. This invasiveness is a necessary feature of criminalized gun possession. After all, policing guns is just like policing drugs. Like drugs, there are a vast number of guns. **Possession is** far more **widespread** than can possibly be policed **so decisions have to be made about** where to devote **resources.** Furthermore, since possession itself is the crime, the only way to police that crime is to shift from actual harm to identifying and preventing risks. As legal scholar Benjamin Levin argues in a forthcoming piece “Searching for guns – like searching for drugs – can easily become pretextual, a proxy for some general prediction of risk, danger, or lawlessness.” In other words, **there must be selective enforcement**, where enforcement includes invasive searches **based on** existing **prejudices about who** i**s** and isn’t **dangerous.** For example, as research by Jeff Fagan and Garth Davies shows, in the late 1990s, the NYPD used suspected weapons violations to justify numerous stops, even though these stops resulted in fewer arrests than stops for other crimes. And when it comes to individualized assessments of who is dangerous and worthy of punishment, every study shows steep, and unfounded, bias. Michelle Alexander, quotes a former U.S. attorney in her recent sensation, “The New Jim Crow,” saying the following: “I had an assistant U.S. attorney who wanted to drop the gun charge against the defendant in a case which there were no extenuating circumstances. I asked, ‘Why do you want to drop the gun offense?’ And he said, ‘He’s a rural guy and grew up on a farm. The gun he had with him was a rifle. He’s a good ol’ boy, and all good ol’ boys have rifles, and it’s not like he was a gun-toting drug dealer.’ But he was a gun-toting drug dealer, exactly.” This isn’t just a point about conscious and unconscious biases towards poor minorities – biases that some imagine can be removed with proper training. [n]o matter how neutral the laws are, their enforcement must remain unequal and unfair. That is because the **policing** involved **would never be tolerated if they affected politically influential groups** to the same degree. These policing practices persist because they are disproportionately directed against marginal populations. Once individuals find themselves arrested gun control reappears as a reason for increasing punishment. Gun possession can be used to enhance sentences for other crimes and even functions as a kind of double punishment when that possession becomes the reason for also tacking on an extra criminal charge. Gun charges are also a part of the excessive and racially unequal over-charging practices that not only contribute to rising incarceration rates but also ends force numerous individuals away from trial and into plea bargains. **Poor Blacks and Latinos are easily intimidated** by charge-happy prosecutors **into** accepting **plea deals**, meaning they never see their day in court. Some even end up **admitting to crimes they did not commit** just to avoid the possibility of more severe punishments. More criminal **gun laws** would only **feed this** deeply unjust **system.** There is an unrecognized gap between the justification for gun control and its most likely effect. There is no reason to expect fair enforcement of gun control laws, or even that they will mainly be used to someone prevent these massacres. That is because how our society polices depends not on the laws themselves but on how the police – and prosecutors and courts – decide to enforce the law. Especially given how many guns there are in the U.S., gun law enforcement will be selective. That is to say, they will be unfairly enforced, only deepening the injustices daily committed against poor minorities in the name of law and order. It is hard to imagine any feasible gun control laws doing much to decrease mass shootings. But it is easy to see how they will become part of the system of social control of mostly black, mostly poor people. There are already too many crimes, there is too much criminal law, and there is far too much incarceration — especially of black people. To the degree that all that is part of the “dark chapter in our history,” given the deep injustice of our society, and especially its policing practices, the actual practice of gun control will continue that dark chapter, not resolve it. Of course, a reasonable gun control regime is logically possible. We can imagine one in our heads. But it is not politically possible in the United States right now. And it is a great error to think that gun control is the path to racial justice. More likely, it is the other way around. Racial justice is a precondition for any reasonable gun control regime. That, perhaps, is why the demands that have emerged from the #blacklivesmatter movement focus not on gun control but instead on demilitarizing the police and investing in “jobs, housing, and schools” for those “black communities most devastated by poverty.” What happened in Charleston is a horrific tragedy. The criminal law will not solve it. I wish I had a better solution ready at hand. I don’t, though I think it would start by freeing our political imagination from instinctively reaching for the criminal law.

### T/ White Republican Backlash [:35]

Gun control, regardless of its consequences or solvency, will always be perceived negatively and spun as right wing propaganda, fueling animosity, **Guardian ’13:**

**The number of anti-government, far-right extremist groups has soared to record levels** since 2008 and they are becoming increasingly militant, according to a report by the Southern Poverty Law Center. It says the number of groups in the "Patriot" movement stood at 1,360 in 2012, up from 149 in 2008 when Barack Obama was first elected president, an increase of 813%. The report said the rise was **driven by opposition to** Obama and the "spluttering rage" over **federal** attempts at **gun control**. Those who were identified as "militia" groups or the paramilitary wing of the Patriot movement, numbered 321, up from 42 in 2008, the SPLC said in its report. Concern over a "truly explosive growth" of groups on the radical right, along with a rise in domestic terrorist plots, has prompted the SPLC to write to US attorney general Eric Holder and Homeland Security secretary Janet Napolitano, warning of the potential for domestic terrorism and urging them create a new, inter-agency task force to assess whether it has adequate resources to deal with it. The stories you need to read, in one handy email Read more The report says that the numbers far exceed the "high-water mark" of 820 groups in 1990s when the rise in militias was fuelled by the Waco siege, the Brady Bill and the 1994 assault weapons ban. Richard Cohen, the SPLC president and a member of the Department of Homeland Security's group to counter violent extremism, wrote in the letter: "On October 25, 1994, six months before the Oklahoma City bombing, we wrote attorney general Janet Reno about the growing threat of domestic extremism. Today we write to express similar concerns. "As in the period before the Oklahoma City bombing, we now are seeing ominous threats from those who believe that the government is poised to take their guns." Timothy McVeigh drove a truck full of explosives into a federal building in Oklahoma City in April 1995, killing 168 people, 19 of them children under six, and injured hundreds more. "**We are seeing a** real and **rising threat of domestic terrorism as the number of far-right anti-government groups continues to grow** at an astounding pace," said Mark Potok, SPLC senior fellow and author of the report. "It is critically important that the country take this threat seriously. The potential for deadly violence is real, and clearly rising." Potok said that the demographic factors driving the rise in such groups began before Obama became president – the census bureau predicts that whites will become a minority group in the US by 2043 – but have been fuelled by the changes in America he represents. The growth in extremism has been helped by the "successful exploitation over illegal immigration" and by anger over the gun control debate, he said. Law enforcement **officials have uncovered numerous terrorism conspiracies** born in the militia subculture, **including plots to spread poison**ous ricin powder, to attack federal installations, **and** to **murder federal judges** and other government officials, the report says. Potok cited a study by the Combating Terrorism Center at the West Point military academy, which found that right-wing violence in 2000-2011 surpassed that of the 1990s by a factor of four. He expected extremism to rise, as **anger over gun control had become a "grassroots rebellion".** He said that **20 states are considering laws that would** aim to **nullify federal gun control measures and 500 sheriffs** mainly in western US, who **say they will not enforce any such measures**. Daryl Johnson, a former Department of Homeland Security official, said in a press call that SPLC's numbers were likely to be a "on the conservative end" because they did not include clandestine and underground groups which did not have a presence on the internet. Johnson, who was a member of the now-disbanded non-Islamic terrorism unit at the Department of Homeland Security, authored a report in 2009 warning about the increasing dangers of right-wing extremism which created a political firestorm, and was later withdrawn. He said it was "quite unsettling" that nothing had changed at the DHS in the last four years despite the rise in extremism. Although only a small pool of individuals associated with such groups were potentially violent, and radicalisation was difficult to analyse, Johnson said: "This pool of potentially violent extremists should raise a red flag of concern." He urged FBI and local law enforcement officials to assess the threat, and said more analysis was needed. The SPLC's report on hate and extremism, contained in its quarterly intelligence report, also found that hate groups remained at a near-record level of 1,007 groups in 2012, a slight drop from the 1,018 groups documented in 2011. SLPC defined "Patriot" groups as those who believe that the federal government is engaged in a conspiracy, is prepared to engage in martial law, would take away guns and would force the US into some kind of so-called "One World Nation".

Multiple implications that turn the aff and prove no solvency **A.** you only feed into redneck anger that increases the intensity of the gun culture you criticize **B.** empirically validated that backlash will inspire further violence in acts of resistance and **C.** local law enforcement literally won’t follow through with the aff, so the aff doesn’t fix anything.

### T/ Substitution effect [:40] If handguns were banned criminals switching to deadlier weapons would just lead to more violence, Kopel: If handguns were somehow removed from the hands of malfeasants, would the death toll actually increase? Some misusers would switch to knives (not much less deadly than small handguns), while others would switch to rifles and shotguns (much more likely to kill than handguns). If enough misusers switched from handguns to long guns, the death toll might therefore increase, or so the "substitution argument" goes. Dixon confronts the substitution argument carefully, and provides one of the most comprehensive critiques of substitution theory ever offered by a handgun prohibitionist. **\*327** Dixon is right to take the substitution argument seriously. While handgun wounds are usually survivable, especially if the victim gets medical attention quickly, shotgun blasts at close range are much more likely to be fatal. The shotgun fires a large slug, or from six to more than sixty pellets, with one trigger squeeze. A single shotgun pellet, because it may be of a diameter equal to a small handgun bullet, can inflict nearly as much damage as a small handgun bullet. [[177](http://i2i.org/SuptDocs/IssuPprs/lrstlupl.htm#177)] Wound ballistics and firearms experts concur that at short range, a shotgun is by far the deadliest weapon. [[178](http://i2i.org/SuptDocs/IssuPprs/lrstlupl.htm#178)] Anti-prohibition writers such as David Hardy, Gary Kleck, and Don Kates have argued that a high level of substitution of long guns for handguns would occur in the case of a[n] hypothetical American handgun ban. Dixon offers a careful rebuttal of their arguments, and concludes that (since he has placed the burden of proof on prohibition opponents) the case for a substitution effect has not been proven convincingly enough to overcome what he considers the strong evidence for handgun prohibition. Overlooked in the discussion of a substitution effect resulting from a hypothetical American handgun ban is non- hypothetical evidence from other countries. As Dixon showed earlier in his article, countries with more handguns per capita tend to have more handgun homicides per capita. [[179](http://i2i.org/SuptDocs/IssuPprs/lrstlupl.htm#179)] Switzerland, which has, by world standards, relatively lenient handgun laws, has more handgun homicides per capita than countries where handgun laws are tougher. [[180](http://i2i.org/SuptDocs/IssuPprs/lrstlupl.htm#180)] From the handgun density/handgun homicide correlation in Switzerland and other nations (as well as from other evidence detailed supra), Dixon concludes that handgun density strictly correlates with handgun homicide. [[181](http://i2i.org/SuptDocs/IssuPprs/lrstlupl.htm#181)] Let us ****\*328**** assume that Dixon is right. In countries such as Australia and Canada, where handgun laws are much stricter than in Switzerland, the handgun homicide rate is lower than in Switzerland, but the total homicide rate is over 100 percent greater. [[182](http://i2i.org/SuptDocs/IssuPprs/lrstlupl.htm#182)] The reason cannot be that Australians and Canadians are more prone to want to kill somebody than the Swiss are - Dixon has explicitly assumed that human nature in developed countries is roughly similar everywhere. [[183](http://i2i.org/SuptDocs/IssuPprs/lrstlupl.htm#183)] So why then do Canada and Australia have more murders, even though they have stricter handgun laws, and fewer handgun murders? One plausible explanation is the substitution effect. A sufficiently large number of Australians and Canadians, unable to obtain handguns, do their shooting with rifles or shotguns; their victims die, whereas if they had been shot with handguns, many would have survived. Although some Australian and Canadian assailants, unable to obtain handguns, switched to less deadly weapons (such as clubs), the number of assailants who switched to rifles and shotguns was sufficiently large to increase the overall death toll. If we have plausible evidence to suggest that a substitution effect may have occurred in Australia and Canada, could a similar effect occur in the United States? [[184](http://i2i.org/SuptDocs/IssuPprs/lrstlupl.htm#184)] **\*329** Dixon quotes research developed by Don Kates and Mark Benenson that if 30% of persons attempting homicide switched from handguns to long guns, while the other 70% switched to knives, total homicide would increase substantially. If 50% switched to long guns, the homicide rate could double, even if none of the persons switching to knives killed anyone. [[185](http://i2i.org/SuptDocs/IssuPprs/lrstlupl.htm#185)] A National Institute of Justice study of felons in state prisons found that 72% of the handgun criminals said they would switch to sawed-off shotguns if handguns became unavailable. [[186](http://i2i.org/SuptDocs/IssuPprs/lrstlupl.htm#186)] A 72% substitution rate would lead to an enormous multiplication of the current homicide rate, and Kleck expects that substitution would occur at about 70%. Dixon retorts that criminals are apt to be braggarts and liars, and might claim that nothing, including a handgun ban, could stop them from committing any crime they chose. Accordingly, the 72% substitution figure might be too high. True enough. But at the same time, at least some criminals may be highly suspicious and mistrustful of authority. Although the National Institute of Justice polling, conducted through written response to written questions, offered the respondents anonymity, some of the prisoners might have believed that their responses would not in fact be anonymous; the polling might be a "setup" to discern their plans after release, and provide a reason for denying parole. Thus, some handgun criminals might have falsely said that they would not substitute sawed-off shotguns for unavailable handguns. Do the number of braggart criminals who falsely said that they would use sawed-off shotguns outnumber the number of mistrustful criminals who falsely said they would not? It is difficult to say with certainty. But since 72% of the criminals said they would substitute, and since only 30% substitution is needed to increase substantially the homicide rate, there is a wide margin for error to assume that bragging criminals outnumber suspicious ones. Dixon critiques the Benenson and Kates estimate of a homicide rate increase because Benenson and Kates assumed that handgun users who did not switch to long guns would switch "downward" to the next most deadly weapon, knives. Almost certainly, some handgun users would, rather than using knives, turn to even less deadly weapons, such as fists, or would not attempt murder in the first place, absent a handgun. [[187](http://i2i.org/SuptDocs/IssuPprs/lrstlupl.htm#187)] But when calculating expected deaths resulting from substitution, Kates and Benenson assumed that none of the persons who switched to knives would kill anyone; in terms of resulting deaths, therefore, Kates and Benenson underestimated the ****\*330**** deaths that would be caused by murderers who switched downward to less lethal weapons. Even assuming that none of the persons who switched down killed anyone, the homicide rate would double if half of the handgun-deprived criminals switched "up" to long guns. [[188](http://i2i.org/SuptDocs/IssuPprs/lrstlupl.htm#188)] Another tack taken by Dixon is to argue that high rates of substitution are unlikely because long guns are so inferior for most criminal purposes. He notes first of all that less than 10% of murders are currently perpetrated with long guns. [[189](http://i2i.org/SuptDocs/IssuPprs/lrstlupl.htm#189)] This is true, but, as Dixon strenuously argues, handguns are widely preferred as murder weapons, and widely available. Thus, it should not be surprising that more than 6 out of 7 gun murderers chose the "best" tool, a handgun. But what people choose when the "best" option is available does not prove how they would behave if only inferior options were available. Today, virtually all hard liquor drinkers consume the "best" hard liquor available - namely legally-produced hard liquor whose production is regulated by the government to guarantee standards of safety. Probably less than 5% of American hard liquor consumers drink bathtub gin, moonshine, and other home- brewed liquors whose safety cannot be guaranteed. Does the fact prove that very few liquor drinkers would, if legal liquor became unavailable, substitute home-brewed liquor? To the contrary, the experience of alcohol prohibition showed that a large percentage of liquor consumers, if unable to obtain safe, legal liquor, will switch to inferior, dangerous homemade liquor. [[190](http://i2i.org/SuptDocs/IssuPprs/lrstlupl.htm#190)] That murderers only rarely use long guns today does not prove that murders would eschew long guns if handguns were unavailable, any more than drinkers of legal liquor would eschew bathtub gin. [[191](http://i2i.org/SuptDocs/IssuPprs/lrstlupl.htm#191)] As another argument against substitution, Dixon points out that long guns are less concealable thanandguns. Even when sawed off, a shotgun is still about 11 inches long, making it slightly larger than big handguns, and much larger than the small, low-caliber handguns which are frequently used in crime. Would sawed-off shotguns frequently be substituted in a **\*331** robberies? Putting an 11 inch shotgun in one's front pocket would not be very effective concealment. On the other hand, sticking the shotgun in the inner pocket of a large coat or jacket would seem reasonably effective.

### T/ Informal market [:25]

During a ban, smugglers and private machinists easily sell guns, **Kates ‘82:**

Don B. Kates Jr (practices law with O'Brien and Hallisey in San Francisco), "Gun control versus gun prohibition," American Bar Association Journal, September 1982 AZ

Nor is there any reason to think that even a national prohibition could prevent the development of a illegal black market sufficient to serve both criminals and ordinary citizens. **If**, for instance, **handguns were smuggled** into his\* country **at the rate** at which federal officials estimate **marijuana is, more than 20 million** guns of the size used to kill John Lennon **could be imported** illegally **in a**ny **year.** (There are only 60 million legally owned handguns at present.) Moreover, **any competent machinist can build a revolver or** automatic **pistol** from pot metal for a fraction of what even the cheapest commercially produced handgun costs. Can it be doubted that **there would be thousands** of "entrepreneurs" **willing to build $15** junk **[handguns]** .45s and .38s **for** a 500 per cent profit at **illegal** black market **sale**? Of course, this type of gun would not fire more than a few hundred rounds and would be accurate only at close range. But that is adequate for a buyer who wants a gun only for murder, robbery, or self-defense.

The growth of the underground market would be so explosive that no legal measure could stop it – means you have no solvency, and outweighs the aff since legal guns can at least be regulated, **Cook et al ‘06:**

Philip J. Cook – professor at Duke University and NBER; Jens Ludwig – professor at Georgetown University and NBER ; Sudhir Venkatesh - professor at Columbia University; Anthony A. Braga – professor at Harvard University: “Underground Gun Markets” research was supported by a grant from the Joyce Foundation and written in part while Cook and Ludwig were resident fellows at the Rockefeller Foundation’s Bellagio Study and Research Center; August 2, 2006 Don Terry – staff reporter, “How Criminals Get Their Guns: In Short, All Too Easily,” The New York Times, March 11, 1992, p. A1IG 12/16/15

**Underground gun markets** have **developed** in America **in response to regulations that** seek to **prohibit** **ownership** and possession by that sub-set of the population deemed to be at unacceptably high risk of misusing guns – primarily youth and adults with serious prior criminal records – while preserving easy access for everyone else. Whether 1 Most of what is known about the underground gun market comes from interviews with incarcerated prisoners or inner-city youth (for example Wright and Rossi, 1994, Webster et al., 2002, Sheley and Wright, 1993, Callahan and Rivara, 1992). However such interviews can at best shed light on how a subset of the retail market operates, and are not informative about other aspects of market structure or conduct. 3 the gun market can be segmented in this way remains the topic of spirited debate in U.S. policy circles. In Section 1 we review this regulatory system and note that a few jurisdictions, including Chicago, go further and essentially prohibit the private possession of handguns, the type of gun most commonly used in crime and violence. The fact that Chicago has unusually restrictive regulations makes the city an interesting case study. Economists and other skeptics like to point out that **government prohibitions** on transactions **are difficult to enforce**; the ingenuity of the marketplace, motivated by profit, will overcome whatever legal obstacles are put in place. If true for handguns in Chicago, then we would expect to find that youths and criminals are able to acquire them with little trouble (low transaction costs) at prices not that much higher from those in the legal market. As New York University law professor James Jacobs observes in this regard, “Some criminals claim that it is as easy to buy a gun on the streets as it is to buy fast food. **One Chicago gang member stated, ‘It’s like going through the drive-through** window. **Give me some fries, a Coke, and a 9-millimeter”** (2002, p. 150).2

### T/ Pre-ban rush [:15]

People rush to buy guns as restrictions are called for, Obama proves, **Devaney 15:[[1]](#footnote-1)**

Gun production has more than doubled over the course of the Obama administration, according to a new report from the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives. The manufacturing boom has come in the face of the president’s push to expand background checks and place new restrictions on guns in the wake of high-profile shootings like the recent mass-killing in Charleston, S.C., and the 2012 massacre at a Newtown, Conn., elementary school. The numbers paint a picture of gun owners who are concerned about new restrictions on their Second Amendment rights, activists say. “The ATF report confirms what we already know, that Barack Obama deserves the 'Gun Salesman of the Decade' award,” said Erich Pratt, spokesman for the Gun Owners of America. "People have been rushing to buy firearms because they’re afraid that Obama will take away their Second Amendment rights.” The ATF’s annual firearms commerce report tracks the number of guns manufactured in the United States, which provides an indication of gun sales around the country. The number of guns manufactured increased by 18 percent during the George W. Bush administration, while the Clinton administration actually saw a 9 percent reduction. But under President Obama, gun production has spiked 140 percent to 10.8 million firearms in 2013, the most recent year for which data is available. The year before President Obama entered office, gun manufacturers produced about 4.5 million firearms. “President Obama has been relentless in his attacks on the Second Amendment, and it’s not shocking people are frightened and want to protect themselves,” National Rifle Association spokeswoman Jennifer Baker said. “He’ll stop at nothing to strip people of their constitutional rights to self-protection." The spike in gun sales stems from a “constant attack on our constitutional right to keep and bear arms,” said Joe Neville, director of political affairs at the National Association for Gun Rights. “President Obama has made it very clear he wants to strip away our gun rights, so people are going out and purchasing more firearms and ammunition,” Neville explained. But gun safety advocates say this is nothing more than a “scare tactic” employed by the gun industry. “The gun lobby seizes on those fears and uses scare tactics and doomsday rhetoric in order to sell more guns,” said Mark Prentice, spokesman for Americans for Responsible Solutions, the gun safety group run by former congresswoman Gabby Giffords, who survived a 2011 mass shooting in Tucson. Pistols are the most popular type of gun, accounting for 4.4 million of the firearms made in 2013, according to the report. Meanwhile, gun manufacturers produced 3.9 million rifles and 1.2 million shotguns. The number of pistols made has nearly tripled during the Obama administration, which could also reflect more people turning to firearms for personal protection, Pratt suggested. “Even in their homes, many gun owners prefer using handguns for self-defense,” Pratt said. This story was updated at 4:18 p.m.

### T/ Meta-analysis on crime statistics [:20]

#### Consensus of evidence shows gun bans don’t solve crime – they increase it, Lott ‘01:[[2]](#footnote-2)

There is a vigorous debate over the relationship between guns and crime, with some pointing to the positive relationship between sales of a gun magazine, Guns & Ammo, and murder rates and others pointing to a negative relationship between survey data on gun ownership and various violent crime rates or the lack of a relationship between the sales of other gun magazines and crime.2 Cross‐country data are also brought into the controversy. Despite this discussion, to date, **there is no statistically significant evidence** by academics **that gun control laws** such as the federal Brady Act or assault weapons bans or state waiting periods, background checks, or one‐gun‐a‐month rules **reduce crime**. Some **evidence even indicates** that **these rules increase** the **crime** rate.3 In the debate over concealed handgun laws, the range of estimates using panel **data range from little** or no **reductions in violent crime to** fairly **large reductions in crime when law‐abiding citizens are allowed to carry concealed guns**. Indeed, the papers in this issue that examine this relationship all continue to report benefits and no costs from these laws. The results presented in this volume examining gun laws such as waiting periods, one‐gun‐a‐month rules, the Brady Act, and safe‐storage laws continue to confirm other studies that show gun control either has no effect or increases the crime rate. The papers examining the impact of gun laws on people’s safety do so from a variety of angles: cross‐country analysis relating gun laws to homicide rates (Jeffrey Miron), the impact of gun laws on the number of police deaths (David Mustard), the impact of juvenile gun possession on crime rates (Thomas Marvell), and the impact of gun laws on the number of accidental gun deaths and suicides by juveniles (myself and John Whitley).

#### Prefer it – Lott’s studies are the most reliable data on gun control, Huemer 03:[[3]](#footnote-3)

John **Lott** and David Mustard **conducted** a study, probably **the most rigorous and comprehensive study in the** gun control **literature**, on the effects of nondiscretionary laws on crime rates.Footnote **Lott’s study uses time-series and cross-sectional data for all 3,054 counties in the U**nited **S**tates from 1977 to 1992. Overall, states with shall-issue laws have a violent crime rate just over half (55%) of the rate in other states.Footnote This alone does not establish that the more restrictive gun laws are a cause of the dramatically higher violent crime rates in the states that have them, since the correlation could be explained by the hypothesis that states that already have higher crime rates are more likely to pass restrictive gun laws. The latter hypothesis, however, would not explain why violent crime rates fell after states adopted shall-issue concealed carry laws.Footnote **After** performing a multiple-regression analysis to **control[ling] for numerous other variables**—such as arrest and conviction rates, prison sentence lengths, population density, income levels, and racial and gender makeup of counties—Lott found that upon the adoption of shall-issue laws, murder rates declined immediately by about 8 percent, rapes by 5 percent, and aggravated assaults by 7 percent, with declines continuing in subsequent years (Lott explains the latter fact by the gradually increasing numbers of individuals obtaining permits).

### T/ Self defense surveys [:15]

#### Average citizens owning guns greatly decreases crime, surveys validate, Kates ‘13:[[4]](#footnote-4)

Many Americans are armed, and handguns are used for self-defense millions of times per year. 36 **“[S]urveys reveal** a great deal of self-defensive use of firearms, in fact, **more defensive gun uses than crimes committed with firearms**.” 37 For instance, “firearms are used **over half a million times in** a typical year against **home invasion** burglars; usually **the burglar flees as soon as [t]he[y] find**s **out** that **the victim is armed**, and **no shot is** ever **fired.**” 38 Overwhelmingly when victims draw guns, criminals flee. **Criminals** flee armed citizens because they **want helpless victims, not gunfights** with armed ones. Indeed, 36 percent of the respondents **in [a study of** imprisoned **juvenile criminals**] reported having decided at least “a few times” not to commit a crime because they believed the potential victim was armed. **Seventy percent** of the respondents **report**ed **having been “scared off**, shot at, wounded, or captured **by an arm**ed crime victim.” 39 Criminological studies conclude that “[r]esistance with a gun appears to be [the] most effective [response to criminal attack] in preventing serious injury [to victims, and] . . . for preventing property loss.” 40 As professors Hans Toch and Alan Lizotte write: [W]hen used for protection, firearms can seriously inhibit aggression and can provide a psychological buffer against the fear of crime. Furthermore, the fact that national **patterns show little** violent **crime where guns are most dense** implies that guns do not elicit aggression in any meaningful way. . . . Quite the contrary, these findings suggest that high saturations of guns in places, or something correlated with that condition, inhibit illegal aggression. 4

### T/ Econ decline [:40]

A ban on handguns would collapse the gun industry, a huge part of the economy in both sales and employment, **Fendrock:**

**U.S. Firearms are produced by 5,400 licensed manufacturers.** 40% are sold by unlicensed private sellers. In addition, **as of October, 2012** according to the Bureau of Tobacco, Firearms and Explosive records, **there were 50,812 federally licensed gun dealers** in the United States. These statistics gives an overview of the size of industry and business supporting and profiting from the production and distribution of firearms in the United States. The accuracy of some of the numbers may be questioned by reasonable individuals but it is clear that **this activity employs thousands** of people **and supports a large number of businesses – manufacturing and marketing**/sales activities. **Restricting** the **possession of firearms would have a** serious – **fatal** in many cases – **effect on these activities. The lucrative American market would be closed** except for the legitimate needs of the government to replace obsolete arms used by the federal, state and municipal law enforcement agencies or to support the Federal government to outfit a growth in the military to meet a perceived threat against the country. If necessary the government could support certain companies in maintaining production capability within their facilities. **Companies** that found themselves unable to compete in the limited market in sales to the tightly controlled hunting and sport shooting would have to adapt their skills and facilities to producing goods for the electro-mechanical needs of industries such as automotive communication, industrial equipment and similar industries. In short, they **would have to** adapt their activities to a changing market or **close shop.**

Unemployment specifically hurts minorities, turns and precludes the aff since they materially have no means of supporting themselves **Taylor ’03:**  
Taylor 3 (Keelanga-Yamahtta, doctoral candidate in the department of African-American studies at Northwestern University) “Civil rights and civil wrongs: Racism in America today” International Socialist Review 03 Issue 32, November–December 2003   
Even at its historic low of 7.2 percent, **Black unemployment** still **was twice the unemployment level for whites.**9 These numbers did not take into account the nearly one million Black men locked up in prison and jail, which, by some estimates would increase the overall unemployment level by two percentage points.10 Moreover, since 2001, **when the economy officially went into recession**, official Black unemployment has drifted between 10 and 11 percent. An added result of the recession is that the drop in Black poverty rates, a result of the economic expansion of the 1990s, has been reversed and Black poverty is again on the rise. According to the Census Bureau, 24 percent of Blacks now live in poverty–up from 22 percent in 2001.11 Additionally, there was a 3 percent decrease in the Black median income.12. “**African Americans tend to be the last** to be **hired** when the economy is booming. **That means that they also tend to be the first to lose their jobs when a downturn hits**," according to Stephanie Armour writing in USA Today in December 2002. She goes on to say, "job losses have been deep in manufacturing and construction, they have also hit retailers, which lost 39,000 jobs in November. Jobs in those industries tend to be disproportionately held by African Americans…department store hiring was down by 17,000, the worst November for store hiring since 1982."13 In July 2003, the New York Times reported: Unemployment among Blacks is rising at a faster pace than in any similar period since the mid-1970s…nearly 2.6 million jobs have disappeared overall during the last 28 months… nearly 90 percent of those jobs were in manufacturing…with Blacks hit disproportionately harder than whites.14 The disproportionate impact of layoffs on African Americans in the recession of the early 1990s further illustrates how racism compounds an already bad situation when the economy begins to contract.

Employers discriminate and there’s empirically verified causation – **UChicago:**

“Racial Bias in Hiring” http://www.chicagobooth.edu/capideas/spring03/racialbias.html

In the study "Are Emily and Brendan More Employable than Lakisha and Jamal?" Marianne Bertrand, an associate professor at the University of Chicago Graduate School of Business, and Sendhil Mullainathan of Massachusetts Institute of Technology use a field experiment to measure the extent of race-based job discrimination in the current labor market. From July 2001 to May 2002, Bertrand and Mullainathan sent fictitious resumes in response to 1,300 help-wanted ads listed in the *Boston Globe*and the *Chicago Tribune*. They used the callback rate for interviews to measure the success of each resume. Approximately 5,000 resumes were sent for positions in sales, administrative support, clerical services, and customer service. Jobs ranged from a cashier at a store to the manager of sales at a large firm. The catch was that the authors manipulated the perception of race via the name of each applicant, with comparable credentials for each racial group. Each resume was randomly assigned either a very white-sounding name (Emily Walsh, Brendan Baker) or a very African-American-sounding name (Lakisha Washington, Jamal Jones). The authors find that **applicants with white-sounding names are 50 percent more likely to get** called for **an** initial **interview than applicants with African-American-sounding names.** Applicants with white names need to send about 10 resumes to get one callback, whereas applicants with African-American names need to send about 15 resumes to achieve the same result. In addition, race greatly affects how much applicants benefit from having more experience and credentials. White job applicants with higher-quality resumes received 30 percent more callbacks than whites with lower-quality resumes. Having a higher-quality resume has a much smaller impact on [but] African-American applicants, who experienced only 9 percent more callbacks for the same improvement in their credentials.This disparity suggests that in the current state of the labor market, African-Americans may not have strong individual incentives to build better resumes. "For us, the most surprising and disheartening result is seeing that **applicants with African-American names were not rewarded for having better resumes**," says Bertrand. Statistically, the authors found that
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